

CHAPTER 5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) represents the efforts and involvement of a broad range of participants, including public agencies, tribal councils, and private organizations and individuals. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) met and consulted with various Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies throughout the planning process. The BLM conducted and attended many meetings throughout the planning process to keep all interested parties informed, and to solicit opinions and input germane to management of public land resources within the Richfield Field Office (RFO). The general public was also included in the planning process. All interested parties were invited into the planning process by means of various formal and informal methods, including meetings (with public agencies, tribal councils, interest groups, and individuals), scoping meetings, workshops, e-mail correspondence, and distribution of planning posts. This section summarizes these activities.

5.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The land use planning process for the Richfield Field Office formally began on November 1, 2001, when a notice announcing the “Intent to Prepare a Resource Management Plan for Public Lands and Resources in Garfield, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne Counties, UT” was published in the *Federal Register*. Key points regarding public involvement stated in the Notice of Intent (NOI) were as follows:

- The BLM will work closely with interested parties to identify potential management decisions that are best suited to the public’s needs.
- This collaborative process will take into account local, regional, and national needs and concerns....
- This notice initiates the public scoping process to identify planning issues....
- To ensure local community participation and input, public meetings will be held....
- Early participation by all interested parties is encouraged and will help determine the future management of the RFO public lands....
- Written comments will be accepted throughout the planning process....

The NOI invited the public to nominate Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and wild and scenic rivers, and also to comment on the “Preliminary Planning Criteria” (criteria are included in Chapter 1 of this document).

Public involvement will continue through the completion of the Richfield RMP. Publication of the DRMP/DEIS will be followed by a 90-day public comment period and public meetings.

5.2.1 Scoping

The BLM conducted a formal scoping period which ran for 151 days, from November 1, 2001, to April 1, 2002. (The minimum requirement is for a 60-day scoping period.) Comments received during that time were summarized in the *Richfield RMP Scoping Report, July 2002* (available for review on the RMP planning web page at www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/richfield/planning.html). Comments received since the scoping period closed were not summarized in the scoping report; nonetheless, they were considered in

developing the DRMP/DEIS and are included in the administrative record. Comments submitted during scoping for the Henry Mountain RMP in the early 1990s (which was never completed) were also referenced and considered in this planning process.

5.2.1.1 Public Meetings

The BLM held public scoping meetings in five Utah communities in March 2002 (Table 5-1). Registered attendance at the meetings totaled 182. The meetings were structured so that all attendees were given an opportunity to comment if they chose to do so. Five-hundred and sixty individual comments were recorded.

Table 5-1. Public Scoping Meetings

Date	Location	Attendance	Main Issues
March 12, 2002	Richfield, Utah	48	Access, recreation, off-highway vehicle (OHV)
March 13, 2002	Junction, Utah	28	Access, transportation, special designations
March 14, 2002	Manti, Utah	24	Range, access, special designations
March 19, 2002	Loa, Utah	52	Special designations, recreation, OHV
March 21, 2002	Salt Lake City, Utah	30	Recreation, OHV, special designations

5.2.1.2 Written Comments

Written comments submitted during scoping totaled 1,061, including letters and cards, e-mails, faxes, and two petitions with 619 signatures. Comments were submitted from across the nation, but almost half came from Utah. Among the written comments—excluding the petitions—the top issues were wilderness and special designations. These issues were followed closely by recreation and off-highway vehicle use, then range management and livestock grazing, oil and gas leasing and development and mining, and access/transportation. Access/transportation and recreation/OHVs were the big issues identified in the petitions.

Written and oral comments were compiled and analyzed in the *Richfield RMP Scoping Report, July 2002*, available online at <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/richfield/planning.html>. Selected scoping comments are included in *What You Said: Selected Comments From the Richfield RMP Scoping, August 2002*, also available online at the URL above.

5.2.2 Mailing List

An initial mailing list for land use planning was developed from existing RFO mailing lists. This mailing list has been revised and updated regularly throughout the planning process. Those on the mailing list received *Planning Posts* and other notices reporting on the progress of the DRMP/DEIS.

5.2.3 Planning Posts

At key points in the planning process, *Planning Posts* were issued.

- **Planning Post 1, February 2002:** Described the Richfield DRMP/DEIS process and the reason it was needed, listed preliminary planning issues, and provided a notice of public meetings, preliminary schedule, and comment form.
- **Planning Post 2, August 2002:** Summarized the results of scoping.
- **Planning Post 3, March 2004:** Announced the extended schedule for completing the RMP, summarized the draft alternatives, described the wild and scenic river evaluation process, listed river segments found eligible in the preliminary evaluation, and invited comments on the evaluation.

Additional Planning Posts will be issued when the DRMP/DEIS is released, when the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and proposed RMP are released, and when the RMP is approved and the Record of Decision (ROD) signed.

5.2.4 Web Site

A web site to provide Internet access to planning information was established early in the process at <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/richfield/planning.html>. The site serves as a repository for documents related to the RMP development that are maintained in portable document format (PDF) to ensure that they are available to the widest range of users. The web site also provides the public with the means to submit comments or add their names to the mailing list.

5.2.5 Informal Communication

In the spirit of the Secretary of Interior's "4 Cs"—communication, consultation, cooperation, all in the service of conservation—the field manager, land use planner, and other staff communicated with various individuals and groups interested in the RMP, including the following:

- Blue Ribbon Coalition
- Friends of Grover
- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA)
- Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife
- The Nature Conservancy
- Utah Farm Bureau
- Utah Rivers Council
- Utah Shared Access Alliance (USA-ALL)

5.3 COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

Coordination, as required by FLPMA 43 USC § 1712(c)(a), involves ongoing communication between BLM managers and state, local, and tribal governments to ensure that the BLM considers pertinent provisions of non-BLM plans in managing public lands; seeks to resolve inconsistencies between such plans; and provides ample opportunities for state, local, and tribal government representatives to comment in the development of BLM's RMPs (43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1610.3-1). Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations further require timely coordination by Federal agencies in addressing interagency issues (40 CFR 1501.6) and in avoiding duplication with tribal, state, county, and local procedures (40 CFR 1506.2).

Cooperation goes beyond the coordination requirement of FLPMA, entailing collaboration between the BLM and other governmental entities (Federal, state, local, or tribal) to develop a land use plan and

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis, as defined by the lead and cooperating agency provisions of the CEQ's NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1501.5 and 1501.6). Cooperating agency and related roles may be formalized through an agreement.

5.3.1 Coordination with other Federal Agencies

In developing this DRMP/DEIS, BLM coordinated with numerous other Federal agencies. (Additional agencies are listed below under consultation.)

- **National Park Service:** Contacts were made early in the planning process with Capitol Reef National Park, Canyonlands National Park, and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA), the three national park units that share boundaries with the RFO. BLM staff from the Price and Richfield Field Offices met with the Capitol Reef Park Superintendent and his staff during scoping and discussed issues of mutual concern. The land use planner and field manager communicated regularly with the superintendent throughout the process through e-mails, phone calls, and field trips. The superintendent and his staff provided invaluable advice and counsel, as well as special expertise on critical issues, including ACECs and wild and scenic rivers. Staff at Canyonlands National Park was contacted regarding Horseshoe Canyon, a detached unit of Canyonlands surrounded by public lands administered by the RFO. Glen Canyon NRA submitted formal scoping comments addressing several issues and more recently assigned a liaison to work with the BLM on the Richfield RMP.
- **U.S. Forest Service:** The RFO shares common boundaries with the Dixie, Fishlake, and Manti-LaSal National Forests. The USFS is engaged in revising land use plans for those national forests concurrent with the BLM revising its plans. Along with sharing boundaries, the two agencies share many common issues. Communication with the USFS regarding planning has been frequent and largely informal. USFS and BLM personnel reviewed a potential wild and scenic river segment that crossed national forest and public lands, and planning personnel from both agencies meet informally to better coordinate planning efforts. USFS personnel occasionally participate in the BLM's planning-related interdisciplinary team meetings.
- **U.S. Geological Survey:** USGS assigned a staff specialist from its Moab office to serve as a liaison with the BLM on the Richfield DRMP/DEIS. To date, USGS has submitted formal comments on the DRMP/DEIS and provided a scientific review of a preliminary study on Mancos Shale erosion.
- **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:** Early in the planning process, BLM developed a Regional Consultation Agreement with the USFWS that provided for the participation of USFWS personnel on BLM interdisciplinary teams. Through this agreement, they were given an opportunity to provide input on planning issues, data collection and review, and development of alternatives. USFWS staff also provided written input on resource concerns. (Endangered Species Act [ESA] consultation is discussed in Section 5.4.3 below.)

5.3.2 Cooperating Agencies

As discussed in Section 1.7.2, the BLM is required by law to prepare NEPA analysis and documentation in cooperation with State and local governments, and other agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise (42 USC 4331(a), 4332(2)). Qualified agencies, tribes, or other governments that enter into formal cooperation under this provision are called cooperating agencies. In support of the cooperating agency mandate, BLM invited local, county, state, and tribal agencies to become cooperating agencies in the development of the Richfield RMP. Seven agencies accepted the invitation to become formal cooperating agencies in developing the RMP and signed cooperating agency agreements: the State of Utah; Garfield, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne counties; and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Emery County, outside but adjacent to the planning area, was likewise afforded cooperating agency status based on its MOU with the Price Field Office.

The cooperating agency agreements define the relationship between the BLM and the agencies in developing the Richfield RMP. As stated in the MOUs,

...BLM is required to assure the RMP complies with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), particularly Title II, Section 202, Land Use Planning, including Section 202(c)(9) that, among other things, directs the BLM to coordinate its land use planning activities with local governments, to consider local plans in developing BLM land use plans, to assist in resolving, to the extent possible, inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal government plans, and to be consistent with state and local plans to the maximum extent, consistent with Federal law and the purposes of the Act.

Cooperating agency representatives participated regularly in the DRMP/DEIS planning process, including serving on interdisciplinary teams and sub-teams, and were given full access to and opportunities to comment on working documents and other pre-decisional information. In particular, the counties have been engaged in the travel management issues including OHV route inventory and designation process and, to date, have cooperated in over 60 information sharing meetings.

The Utah Governor's Office will receive copies of this DRMP/DEIS for its use in determining consistency with state plans.

5.4 CONSULTATION

Consultation is the formal effort to obtain the advice or opinion of another agency regarding an aspect of land use management for which that agency has particular expertise or responsibility, as required by statute or regulation. Federal laws require BLM to consult with American Indian Tribes, the State Historic Preservation Office, the USFWS, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the planning/NEPA decision-making process. This section documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing the DRMP/DEIS.

5.4.1 Consultation with American Indian Tribes

Regardless of whether a Federally-recognized tribe enters into a cooperating agency relationship, its fundamental connection to the BLM is based on tribal sovereignty, manifested through the government-to-government relationship.

BLM provides government officials of Federally-recognized tribes with opportunities to comment on and to participate in the development of land use plans. The BLM considers comments, notifies consulted tribes of final decisions, and informs them of how their comments were addressed in those decisions. At a minimum, officials of Federally-recognized tribal governments must be offered the same level of involvement as state and county officials. Land use plans and coordination activities must address the following:

- 1. Consistency with Tribal Plans.** Section 202(c)(9) of FLPMA requires the BLM to coordinate plan preparation for public lands with plans for lands controlled by Indian tribes so that the BLM's plans are consistent with tribes' plans for managing tribal resources to the extent possible, consistent with Federal law. This coordination allows the BLM and tribes to develop management prescriptions for a larger land base than either agency can address by itself.

2. Protection of Treaty Rights. Land use plans must address the protection of treaty rights assured to Indian tribes concerning tribal uses of public lands and resources (such treaty rights in the West are generally limited to Northwestern tribes that were subject to the Stevens Treaties of the 1850s).

3. Observance of Specific Planning Coordination Authorities. In addition to the FLPMA consistency provisions discussed above, land use plans must comply with the following statutes and executive orders:

- **Section 101(d) (6) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).** This act requires the BLM to consult with Indian tribes when historic properties of traditional religious or cultural importance to a tribe would be affected by BLM decision making.
- **American Indian Religious Freedom Act.** This act requires the BLM to protect and preserve the freedom of American Indians and Alaska Natives in exercising their traditional religions, including access to sites and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites.
- **Executive Order 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites).** This Executive Order requires the BLM to accommodate access to and use of sacred sites and to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of sacred sites to the extent practicable, permitted by law, and not inconsistent with essential agency functions. The BLM must ensure reasonable notice is provided to tribes, through government-to-government relations, of proposed actions or land management policies that may restrict future access to or ceremonial uses of, or adversely affect the physical integrity of, sacred sites, including proposed land disposals.
- **Executive Order (EO) 12898 (Environmental Justice).** This EO requires the BLM to take into account the relevant CEQ guidelines and Department of the Interior (DOI) policies and goals.
- **Consultation Under the Endangered Species Act with Indian Tribes.** DOI's Secretarial Order 3206: American Indian Tribal Rights, Federal-Tribal Trust Responsibilities, dated June 5, 1997, and the Endangered Species Act of 1973, requires DOI agencies to consult with Indian tribes when agency actions to protect a listed species, as a result of compliance with the Endangered Species Act, affect or may affect Indian lands, tribal trust resources, or the exercise of American Indian tribal rights. Consultation under this Secretarial Order should be closely coordinated with regional or field offices of the USFWS and/or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service for game and non-game species.

Land use plans and their accompanying EISs must identify potential effects on Indian trust resources, trust assets, or tribal health and safety. Any effect must be explicitly identified and documented in the land use plan.

BLM representatives have met with several tribes to inform them of the planning process and solicit information on potential issues and concerns. The Utah Division of Indian Affairs has provided invaluable assistance to the BLM in consultation with the tribes. Tribal consultation on the RMP revision began in May of 2002 and is still ongoing. Meetings and consultation with American Indian Tribes and organizations are listed below.

May 2002	Hopi Tribe (Kykotsmovi, Arizona)
April 2003	Ute Tribe (Ft. Duchesne, Utah)
Feb. 13 – 17, 2006	Southern Ute Indian Tribe (Ignacio, Colorado) Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (Towaoc, Colorado) Navajo Nation (Window Rock, Arizona) Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians (Pipe Springs, Arizona)

	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar City, Utah)
April 19, 2006	Utah Division of Indian Affairs (Salt Lake City, Utah)
June 14, 2006	Navajo Utah Commission (Montezuma Creek, Utah)
June 15, 2006	Hopi Tribe (Kykotsmovi, Arizona)
July 26, 2006	Moapa Paiute Tribe (Moapa, Nevada)
July 18, 2006	Navajo Nation (Window Rock, Arizona)
July 19, 2006	Hopi Tribe (Kykotsmovi, Arizona)
August 30, 2006	Ute Tribe (Ft. Duchesne, Utah)
Oct. 30 – Nov. 3, 2006	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (Towaoc, Colorado) Southern Ute Tribe (Ignacio, Colorado) Navajo Nation (Window Rock, Arizona) Hopi Tribe (Kykotsmovi, Arizona) Kaibab Band of Paiutes (Pipe Springs, Arizona) Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar City, Utah)
April 2 – 6, 2007	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar City, Utah) Navajo Nation (Window Rock, Arizona) Southern Ute Indian Tribe (Ignacio, Colorado)

All of these tribes and organizations expressed interest in the land use planning process and a desire to participate in the process. This participation ranges from the identification of areas important to the tribes within the RFO to being kept informed of the planning progress. Multiple visits have been made to each tribe in an effort to keep them updated on the RMP's progress and obtain their input. Interests of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah revolve around sacred and traditional use concerns in Quitcupah Canyon in eastern Sevier County. The Navajo Nation is interested in establishing a Traditional Cultural Property in the Henry Mountains. This TCP is related to historical events significant in Navajo history concerning Kit Carson and the attempted removal and relocation of the Navajo from Arizona to New Mexico. The BLM has contacted the Navajo Utah Commission in an attempt to involve the Utah Navajo Chapters and obtain input from them.

5.4.2 State Historic Preservation Office

The BLM has worked with the Utah State Historic Preservation Office during the planning process. Although formal consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act usually takes place during implementation, the BLM will consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding DRMP/DEIS cultural resource evaluation recommendations, before the Proposed RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is issued.

5.4.3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The Utah BLM entered into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the USFWS to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Section 7 consultation processes under the Endangered Species Act for

RMP development. Through this MOA, the BLM agreed to promote the conservation of candidate, proposed, and listed species and to informally and formally consult and confer on listed and proposed species and designated and proposed critical habitat during planning to: 1) assure that activities implemented under these RMPs minimize or avoid adverse impacts to such species and any critical habitat; 2) assure that such activities implemented under these RMPs do not preclude future conservation opportunities; 3) use, where possible, formal conference procedures specified in 50 CFR 402 to avoid conflicts between elements contained in the RMPs and the requirements for conservation of the proposed species and proposed critical habitat; and 4) analyze the effects of the RMPs on candidate species pursuant to agency planning requirements.

The BLM has initiated informal consultation with the USFWS on development of the preferred alternative during preparation of this DRMP/DEIS. This consultation is being accomplished by meeting with the USFWS and preparing a draft biological assessment (BA) of the DRMP/DEIS preferred alternative and the potential for beneficial or adverse impacts on threatened and endangered species. USFWS representatives participated regularly in the development of the DRMP/DEIS. Formal Section 7 consultation will commence with the BLM's submission of a final biological assessment prepared for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The USFWS will respond with a biological opinion that will be included in the administrative record. Any terms and conditions identified in the biological opinion would be incorporated into the Record of Decision for the Approved RMP.

5.4.4 Environmental Protection Agency

The Denver office of the EPA assigned a liaison to consult with the BLM on the Richfield DRMP/DEIS. To date, communication with EPA has been informal through phone calls and e-mails. EPA staff have also participated as members of the Air Quality Protocol Group, which includes the BLM, USFS, the State of Utah, and the National Park Service (NPS). The Richfield DRMP/DEIS will be submitted to EPA for review as required by CEQ regulations.

Table 5-2 lists the agencies that assisted with the Richfield DRMP/DEIS. The table also gives a short discussion of the role of each agency.

Table 5-2. Coordination, Cooperation, and Consultation Actions

Agency	Coordination, Cooperation, or Consultation Role
FEDERAL AGENCIES	
U.S. Department of the Interior	
Fish and Wildlife Service	Consultation: Reviews proposals affecting threatened or endangered fish, wildlife, or plant species under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Participates on ID Team; provides Biological opinion on Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
Geological Survey	Coordination: Assigns a liaison and provides planning input.
National Park Service	Coordination: Provides planning input on issues of mutual concern. Participates on ID Team.
U.S. Department of Agriculture	
U.S. Forest Service	Coordination: BLM and USFS coordinate on matters of mutual interest, particularly potential resource conflicts along mutual borders. Participates on ID Team.
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service–Wildlife Services	Coordination: Coordinates annual management plan for animal damage control activities on public lands.

Agency	Coordination, Cooperation, or Consultation Role
Environmental Protection Agency	Consultation: Reviews BLM plans for NEPA compliance. Files <i>Federal Register</i> notices.
STATE AGENCIES	
State of Utah	Cooperation: Provides information concerning environmental issues for which the State of Utah has jurisdiction by law or special expertise. Provides information from state records, including Richfield DRMP/DEIS project impacts on air quality and Class 1 airsheds, fish and wildlife, domestic livestock grazing, socioeconomic impacts, minerals, and State of Utah permitting requirements.
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget	Provides leadership for the initiatives of the Governor, budgeting, planning, and issue coordination by providing accurate and timely data, impartial analyses, and objective recommendations.
Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ), Division of Water Quality (UDWQ)	Coordinates and cooperates on water quality, development of monitoring for visibility standards and guidelines, and collection of air quality data.
Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (UDOGM)	UDOGM issues permits for mineral operations on Federal, state, and private land. Permits are issued only after review of each mine plan. The BLM coordinates with UDOGM on mining authorization.
School and Institutional Trust Land Administration (SITLA)	Manages state school and institutional trust lands.
Utah State Forestry, Emergency Management Agency, State Fire Marshal's Office	Coordinates forest management and fire activities on state lands adjacent to public lands.
Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources	Coordinates and cooperates on vegetation treatment projects, wildlife habitat management, big game herd objectives, and special status species.
Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks and Recreation	Administers and manages state parks.
Utah Department of Transportation	Coordinates and cooperates on transportation planning and highway access.
Utah Geological Survey	Data sharing.
State Historic Preservation Office	Consultation: The BLM consults with the Utah SHPO under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in accordance with the National Programmatic Agreement (NPA) as implemented in the Utah protocol to the NPA.
COUNTY GOVERNMENTS	
Sanpete County Sevier County Piute County Wayne County Garfield County Emery County	The BLM consults and coordinates with counties throughout the Land Use planning process; counties participate in ID team meetings and provide input on issues for which each county has special expertise or jurisdiction by law.

5.5 ADMINISTRATION OF GRAZING ALLOTMENTS IN NATIONAL PARK SERVICE UNITS

The RFO has responsibility for administering grazing allotments within portions of Capitol Reef National Park and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. A description of grazing within the park and recreation area and BLM's responsibilities follows.

5.5.1 Glen Canyon National Recreation Area

Glen Canyon NRA was established on October 27, 1972, under Public Law (P.L.) 92–593. In establishing Glen Canyon NRA, Congress directed that, “The administration of...grazing leases within the recreation area shall be by the BLM. The same policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering...grazing leases on other lands under its jurisdiction shall be followed in regard to lands within the boundaries of the recreation area, subject to provisions of Section 3(a) and 4 of this Act.” The RFO administers livestock grazing on eight allotments that occur on public land and within Glen Canyon NRA: Rockies, Sewing Machine, Waterpocket, Bullfrog, Robbers Roost, Horseshoe Canyon South, Flint Trail, and Slickrock. Horseshoe Canyon South, Flint Trail, and Slickrock allotments currently have no animal unit months (AUMs) allocated for livestock grazing, and the Robbers Roost Allotment has no AUMs allocated for livestock grazing in the Glen Canyon NRA portion of the allotment. Specific management direction for livestock grazing in Glen Canyon NRA is provided for under the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Grazing Management Plan (NPS 1999).

5.5.2 Capitol Reef National Park

On December 18, 1971, Congress abolished the presidentially proclaimed Capitol Reef National Monument and established Capitol Reef National Park, with its final boundary encompassing 241,904 acres (85 Stat. 639, 16 U.S.C. §273 et seq.). This act made provisions for management of grazing, trailing, and stock watering but eliminated grazing after one 10-year renewal of existing permits. P.L. 100–446 in 1988 extended grazing privileges within the park and allowed permittees who legally used park lands for livestock grazing before December 18, 1971 to continue the practice during their lifetime. The law further provided that grazing privileges would be extended for the lifetime of permittees’ children who were born before the park was established.

At this time, grazing occurs on only two allotments within the park: Sandy 3 and Hartnet. The portion of the Sandy 3 allotment within the park is fenced and administered by the National Park Service (NPS). The Hartnet allotment overlaps both BLM and NPS lands.

The BLM and the National Park Service consult, cooperate, and coordinate their efforts in the administration of grazing on the Hartnet Allotment within the park. The goal of this cooperation is to ensure that respective grazing authorizations, range improvements, allotment management plans, resource monitoring, and other grazing actions do not conflict, and to allocate resources appropriately in joint allotments. In 1995, an MOU was signed by managers from the National Park Service and the BLM to provide for a transfer of grazing management responsibilities to the park when sufficient resources, funding, and staffing were present to carry out those responsibilities. At that time, the park took over the issuance of permits for seasonal livestock trailing across its lands. In 1999, Capitol Reef assumed all administration of the Sandy 3 Allotment. The Allotment Management Plan for the Hartnet Allotment, which is currently being revised, will define each agency’s roles and responsibilities. Once the plan is completed, the park will fully administer its portion of the allotment.

5.6 DISTRIBUTION LIST

Copies of the Richfield DRMP/DEIS were made available to the following:

Tribal Governments

- Navajo Nation
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah

- Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe
- Hopi Tribe

Local Governments (Counties)

- Emery County
- Garfield County
- Piute County
- Sanpete County
- Sevier County
- Wayne County

Utah State Agencies

- Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
- School and Institutional Trust Land Administration
- Utah Department of Environmental Quality
- Utah Department of Agriculture
- Utah Department of Transportation
- Utah Department of Natural Resources
- Utah State Engineer's Office
- Utah State Historic Preservation Office
- Utah State Legislature, Government Affairs Committee

Members of Congress

- Senator Orrin Hatch
- Senator Robert Bennett
- Representative Jim Matheson
- Representative Rob Bishop
- Representative Chris Cannon

Department of the Interior Agencies

- National Park Service
 - Capitol Reef National Park
 - Glen Canyon National Recreation Area
 - Canyonlands National Park
- Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Geological Survey

Department of Agriculture Agencies

- USDA Forest Service
 - Intermountain Regional Office
 - Dixie National Forest

- Fishlake National Forest
- Manti-LaSal National Forest
- Natural Resources Conservation Service

Other Non-DOI Federal Agencies

- Environmental Protection Agency
- Federal Highway Administration
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Department of Energy

5.7 LIST OF PREPARERS

As required by NEPA regulations (40 CFR § 1502.17), Table 5-3 lists the people responsible for preparing this DRMP/DEIS.

Table 5-3. List of Preparers

Name	Education/Experience	Resource Specialty
Bureau of Land Management		
Stan Adams	BS, Range Science	Recreation, OHV, Hazardous Materials
Jason Anderson	BS, Geography	GIS Analysis
Lori Armstrong	BS, Botany	Former Associate Field Manager
Doug Bauer	BS, Geology	Minerals
Ron Bolander	BS, MS, Botany	Special Status Species
Laurie Bryant	BLM experience, 30 years	Paleontology
Lisa Bryant	BS, Agriculture and Soils MS, Soil Science	Air, Soils, Watershed, Invasive Species
Douglas Cook	BA, History and Journalism BS, Petroleum Geology and Mathematics	Fluid Minerals
Linda Chappell	BS, Range Management BS, Forest Management	Wildland Fire Management
Cornell Christensen	BS, Range Management	Field Manager
Lorraine Christian	BS, Wildlife and Fisheries Biology	WO Planner; Project Oversight
Vearl Christiansen	BS, Range Science	Vegetation, Livestock Grazing
Chris Colton	BS, Range Management	Wildland Fire Management, Livestock Grazing, Vegetation
Michael Dekeyrel	BS, Wildlife and Range Management	Lands and Realty
Nancy DeMille	BLM experience, 17 years	Lands and Realty
Frank Erickson	BS, Journalism	Project Management, Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, Wilderness Characteristics
Robin Fehlau	BS, Physical Geography MS, Outdoor Recreation	Recreation, OHV
Timothy Finger	BS, Zoology BS, Wildlife Management	Recreation, Wilderness Study Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, Wilderness Characteristics
Sue Fivecoat	BLM experience, 16 years	VRM, Forestry and Woodland Products, Recreation, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Travel Management

Name	Education/Experience	Resource Specialty
Suzanne Grayson	BS, Environmental Science	Fish and Wildlife
Larry Greenwood	BS, Wildlife MS, Botany/Range	Soil, Water and Riparian, Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species
Gary Hall	BS, Range Management	ACEC Sub-team Leader, VRM, Recreation, OHV, Lands and Realty, Minerals, Wilderness Study Areas
Brant Hallows	BS, Range Management Masters Natural Resources	Soil, Water and Riparian
Craig Harmon	BA, Anthropology and Archaeology MA, Anthropology and Archaeology	Cultural Resources
Bert Hart	BS, Range Management	Assistant Planner, Travel Management
Gregg Hudson	BS, Geology	Minerals
Michael Jackson	BS, Geology MS, Geology.	Minerals, Paleontology
Chris Keefe	BS, Wildlife Biology and Fisheries Management	Special Status Species, Biological Assessment, Technical Review
Margaret Kelsey	BS, Natural Resource Management	Wilderness, ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers
Steve Knox	BS, Watershed Management, Forestry option	State Planner; Document Reviewer
Larry Lichthardt	BS, Range Management	Livestock Grazing
Steve Madsen	BS, Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences	Wildlife, Raptors and Migratory Birds
Jeanette Matovich	MA, Anthropology	Document Reviewer
Tom Mendenhall	BS, Fisheries Science	Fish
Dave Mermejo	BS, Recreation	Wilderness, Wilderness Characteristics
Lauren Mermejo	BS, Zoology Graduate Certificate, Environmental Impact Studies	Wilderness Characteristics
Doug Page	MS, Forestry	Forestry and Woodland Products
Jolie Pollet	BA, Geography MS, Forestry and Fire Science	Wildland Fire Management
Garth Portillo	BS, Anthropology	Cultural Resources
Buzz Rakow	BS, Earth Science	Minerals
Dona Rees	BLM experience, 15 years	Wild Horses and Burros
John Russell	MS, Social Sciences BS, Outdoor Recreation AS, Natural Resources	Assistant Planner
Justin Seastrand	BS, Geography	GIS Analysis
Leroy Smalley	BS, Zoology and Chemistry	Vegetation, Livestock Grazing
Gus Warr	BS, Range Science	Wild Horses and Burros
Wayne Wetzel	BS, Earth Science MS, PhD, Geography	Associate Field Manager
Burke Williams	BS, Wildlife Science	Vegetation, Livestock Grazing, OHV
Phil Zieg	BS, Range and Forest Management	Air Quality, Soil, Water and Riparian
Booz Allen and Hamilton		
Erik Anderson	BS, Civil and Environmental Engineering	Soil, Water and Riparian, Minerals
Gary Armstrong	BA, Political Science MA, Public Policy Analysis	Project Management, Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs
Quincy Bahr	BS, Natural Resources Management and Planning MS, (In progress) Natural Resources Management and Planning	Cultural Resources, Paleontology, Wild Horses and Burros, Wildland Fire Management, Livestock grazing, Wilderness Study Areas

Name	Education/Experience	Resource Specialty
Sean Dougherty	BS, Geography	GIS Analysis
John Fomous	LLM, Environmental Law	Public Lands Advisor
Michael Ghazizadeh	BS, Geology MS, Geology MS, Natural Science PhD, Geology	Minerals
Jim May	A.B, Zoology MS, Water Resources Management	Technical Reviewer
Lisa McDonald	BS, Earth Science MS, Mineral Economics PhD, Mineral Economics	Socioeconomics
Dan Morse	BS, Natural Resource Recreation MS, Forestry	VRM, Wildland Fire Management, Forestry and Woodland Products, Recreation, Wilderness Study Areas
Al Pierson	BS, Wildlife Science	Public Lands Advisor
Richard Pinkham	BA, Geography MS, Natural Resource Policy and Management	Socioeconomics
Amanda Pryor	BA, Biology MS, Environmental Biology	NEPA Support, Technical Reviewer
Dana Purrone	BA, Environmental Policy BA, Spanish Pursuing MS, Environmental Policy and Natural Resource Management	Fish and Wildlife
Mike Sumner	BS, Recreation Resource Management	Document Coordination, VRM, Transportation and Access, Glossary, Acronym List, Preparer's List, Appendices
Lloyd Tabing	BS, Natural Resource Management BS, Urban Planning MS, Natural Resource Management	Air Quality, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Cumulative Impacts Analysis
Jeff Ward	BS, Natural Resource Planning and Management	VRM, Recreation, OHV, ACECs
Leslie Watson	BS, Zoology	Vegetation, Special Status Species, Livestock Grazing
Dave Wegner	BS, Aquatic Science MS, Environmental Engineering	Vegetation, Special Status Species, Fish and Wildlife
Amy Wiedeman	BS, Environmental Studies MURP, Urban and Regional Planning	Lands and Realty, ACECs, Quality Assurance/Quality Control
Rocky Mountain Environmental Consultants		
Megan Robinson	BS, Biology, Chemistry and Zoology	Biological Assessment and Threatened, Endangered and Special Status Species
SAGE Environmental, LLC		
Joelle Dickson	BS, Recreation Management	Document Editing and Formatting
Laurie Goldner	BS, Zoology PhD, Zoology	Document Editing
John Rezac	BS, Earth Science Professional Geologist	Document Editing
Steve Torpey	BS, Geology	Document Editing